

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 is currently amended.

Claims 2-10, 12 and 17-20 are original.

Claim 11 is canceled.

Claims 13-16 are withdrawn.

Upon entry of the amendment Claims 1-10 and 12-20 will be pending with Claims 1-10, 12 and 17-20 under active consideration.

The amendment to Claim 1 is supported on page 5, lines 21-23 and by Example 1 in the specification.

No new matter has been added by the amendment.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Zacharia for the helpful and courteous discussion he had with Applicants' U.S. representative on October 11, 2005. At that time, Applicants' U.S. representative proposed an amendment to Claim 1 to more clearly differentiate the claimed carrier film over the cited references Bolt (U.S. 4,416,946), Ukihashi (U.S. 4,123,602) and Hopper (U.S. 4,388,375).

Specifically, Applicants' U.S. representative proposed amending Claim 1 such that the tetrafluoroethylene/ethylene (TFEE) copolymer is laminated directed to both sides of the film of polyester resin. Applicants' U.S. representative noted that none of the cited references teach or suggest this claimed laminated carrier film structure. The Examiner noted that the claimed carrier film could include a polyvinylalcohol (PVA) adhesive between the laminated TFEE and polyester resin films and the presence of this adhesive could give a structure as described in Bolt. Applicants' U.S. representative then proposed amending Claim 1 to include only species of adhesives given in the present specification that do not include PVA adhesives. The Examiner indicated that this amendment would probably overcome the rejections over the cited references.

As the Examiner will note, Claim 1 has been amended as discussed above. Applicants note that the presently claimed carrier film is not taught nor suggested by the cited references, and therefore, the claimed carrier film would not have been anticipated or obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections over the cited references.

Finally, Applicants respectfully request that dependent Claims 13-16 be rejoined if Claim 1 is found to be allowable (M.P.E.P. §821.04).

Application No. 10/763,171
Reply to Office Action of July 18, 2005.

In light of the above remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Donald K. Drummond, Ph.D.
Registration No. 52,834

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)